

BARTON HOOPER.

[To accompany bill H. R. No. 205.]

MARCH 5, 1840.

Mr. S. W. MORRIS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, made the following

REPORT:

*The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Barton Hooper, report :*

That this case has been twice reported on favorably by the committee, viz : on the 27th January, 1838, and, also, 16th January, 1839. The committee adopt the report of the latter date, and report a bill accordingly.

JANUARY 16, 1839.

*The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Barton Hooper, report :*

That, from evidence derived from the Department of War, as well as from that of individuals offered, there is no doubt but that the petitioner served as a soldier in the 12th regiment of the United States troops, in the late war with Great Britain.

He states, upon oath, that he enlisted in 1812; that, at the battle of Williamsburg, Lower Canada, he received a gun-shot wound in the right leg, and was discharged in 1815. In proof of these facts is the deposition of William Langfoot, attested before a justice of the peace of Fauquier county, Virginia, and who is entitled to belief; says that he is personally acquainted with the petitioner, and knows that he was discharged on account of his wounds. The discharge is on file at the Pension office, but does not state that it was on account of disability occasioned by wounds. The petitioner accounts for that omission by saying that, when he was discharged at Pittsburg, he was separated from his officers, Captain Madison and Lieutenant Kellis; that the officer giving the discharge knew nothing of his services or wounds, nor did he then know that he or others would ever be pensioned, much less that a statement of wounds, or other disability in a discharge, would be necessary to the attainment of that object.

The petitioner states that both Captain Madison and Lieutenant Kellis, under whom he served, are dead; and that he, by that event, is precluded from obtaining that kind of evidence required by the strict rules of law in this case.

MARCH 5, 1840.

REPORT:

Mr. S. W. MORRIS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, made the following

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Barton Hooper, report:

That this case has been twice reported on favorably by the committee; viz: on the 27th January, 1832, and also, 16th January, 1833. The committee adopt the report of the latter date, and report a bill accordingly.

JANUARY 16, 1833.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Barton Hooper, report:

That from evidence derived from the Department of War, as well as from that of individuals offered, there is no doubt but that the petitioner served as a soldier in the 18th regiment of the United States troops, in the late war with Great Britain. He states, upon oath, that he enlisted in 1812; that at the battle of Williamsburg, Lower Canada, he received a gun-shot wound in the right leg, and was discharged in 1815. In proof of these facts is the deposition of William Langford, attested before a justice of the peace of Fauquier county, Virginia, and who is entitled to belief; says that he is personally acquainted with the petitioner, and knows that he was discharged on account of his wounds. The discharge is on file at the Pension office, but does not state that it was on account of disability occasioned by wounds. The petitioner accounts for that omission by saying that, when he was discharged at Philadelphia, he was separated from his officers, Captain Madison and Lieutenant Kellis; that the officer giving the discharge knew nothing of his services or wounds, nor did he then know that he or others would ever be pensioned, much less that a statement of wounds, or other disability in a discharge, would be necessary to the attainment of that object. The petitioner states that both Captain Madison and Lieutenant Kellis, under whom he served, are dead; and that he, by that event, is precluded from obtaining that kind of evidence required by the strict rules of law in this case.